

and before it was suppress'd, there were Offers made of striking out whatever was offensive, and Printing those Sheets over again, it seems somewhat hard it should after all be condemn'd to the lining Trunks and Paper-Boxes.

You say *the Title of this Author's Book is long and obscure*: Which is a Charge as False, as 'tis Impertinent. To prove it False, I need do no more than present you with the Title, which runs thus; *A DEFENCE of the Vindication of the Deprived Bishops; wherein The Case of Abiathar is particularly considered, and the Invalidity of Lay-Deprivations is further proved, from the Doctrines received under the Old Testament, continued in the First Ages of Christianity, and from our own Fundamental Laws.* Now I appeal to any Man of Sense, whether this Title be e're a whit too long, or at all obscure. But it seems, Sir, you thought that the Book being suppress'd, and so not likely to come abroad into the World, you might say any thing of it, no matter whether true or false, since few or none would be able to contradict you: And therefore the Author is beholden to you, that you did not fall foul upon the Book it self, but contented your self to Nibble at the Title-Page. But, Good Sir, what matter is it how long or obscure the Title may be, provided the Arguments that are in it be clear and conclusive? I have often known a Glorious Title prefix'd to a very indifferent Book; as on the other hand, an Excellent Book have but an ordinary Title; this being a matter of so little moment, that 'tis often left to the Discretion of the Bookseller or Corrector. And truly I believe no one will judge of the Goodness or Badness of a Book, by its Title, unless they be such as look no further than the Title Pages of Books. But it is the way of some Men, to endeavour to raise Prejudices against some sort of Books, because, forsooth, the Style, or Title-Page, or something else as trifling, which does not concern the Merits of the Cause, is not to their minds.

I readily grant you, That they do a great *Injury to the Church as to its Real Rights, who pretend to such as are not so.* But then, Sir, I must desire you to grant me, That they

do a greater Injury to it, who tamely give up its Real Rights, and oppose those who would defend them. And as they are no *Friends to the Church*, who draw upon it the *Jealousy of those in Authority*; so they are Friends to neither Church nor State, who give the latter such a Power over the former, as cannot be warranted by Scripture, Reason, or the earliest Antiquity.

You profess your self glad, That this Author is neither a *Clergyman*, nor a *Member of the Establish'd Church*. But I am sure all good men are sorry both for the one and the other; since a Person of his great Piety, and profound Learning, would be a Support and Ornament to both Church and Clergy.

As for the Measures of the Magistrate's Power over the Church, and whether it reaches so far, as that he may forbid the Exercise of those Offices in his own Dominions, which are inseparable from the Episcopal Character, by those who will not declare themselves his Friends, it is the matter in Debate; and your saying, That *indeed it's hard he should not have such a Power*, does not determine it. I am sure the Primitive Christians of the first Three hundred Years after Christ, in some Instances would not declare themselves Friends to the *Roman Emperors*, in such a manner as they required; and yet even in such a Case, they did not think that they had a Power of hindring any particular Bishop from the exercise of his Function in his particular District. If you say the Case is alter'd since the Civil Magistrates are become Christians: It is answer'd, That a Christian Government has not the least Authority or Jurisdiction over the Church in purely Spirituals (such as certainly is the Exercise of a Spiritual Power within a particular District), more than a Heathen. The Civil Magistrate receives nothing more at his Baptism, than every ordinary Christian does; and truly there is no reason why he should expect it; since those Benefits and Advantages which he receives by his Admission into the Church, are far greater than the Church receives from him by his defending and securing its Temporal Rights and Privileges. And  
though

though we should suppose the Clergy could be so false to the Trust committed to them by Christ, the Apostles, and their Successors, as to give up these their unalienable Spiritual Rights to the Civil Power; yet such a Donation would be a perfect Nullity, the Magistrate would have no more Right to them by it, than a Man would have to an Estate which he buys with a crack'd Title.

As for the Learned Dr. *Hody's* share in this Controversy, it is certain he has said nothing in his long Book, which the most Impartial and Judicious of his own side can judge to be capable in any tolerable measure either to satisfy the doubtful, or convince those that are of a contrary Opinion. He argues upon such a Supposition, as not only quite overturns what he has said concerning the *Reasonableness of submitting to the present Possessor*, &c. but also makes that huge Heap of Instances which he has amass'd together, though they were never so much to his purpose, as some of 'em are far enough from it, to signify nothing at all.

The Doctor supposes the *worst* that can be imagined; Pref. That the *Deprivation* is not only *unjust and uncanonical*, but, as he supposes all Lay Deprivations to be, altogether *invalid*; i. e. to be perfectly *null*; yet notwithstanding all this, the Doctor undertakes to prove, That 'tis Just, Reasonable, and agreeable to Antiquity, to submit to the present Possessor; i. e. to one that is not, nor can be, according to his Hypothesis, a Bishop of that particular Diocess. For all own that the Nature of an Invalid Act is such, that it leaves no Effect behind it, produces no Alteration as to matter of Right, any more than if no such Act had passed. Thus, for instance, if the Pope should pretend, as they did formerly, to deprive and depose a King of *England* from his Power and Dignity; nay, and if he could second such a pretended Deposition by Arm'd Force, and drive him out of his Kingdoms; yet no one can imagine that the Throne would thereby become vacant, but that the Prince would have the same Right he had before, and the Subjects as much oblig'd as ever, to adhere to their Banish'd Sovereign, notwithstanding any

any other Person the Pope might intrude upon them. Now if, as the Doctor supposes, such is the Case of Lay-Deprivations; that they are thus null and invalid, I cannot see how an *Anti-Bishop* can be indeed a Bishop at all; ( I mean, of that particular District ) since the See is not made void by such a Deprivation, and the Bishop in Possession has notwithstanding all the same Rights which he had before.

And 'tis in this sense, and upon this Supposition, that Chap. 1. Sect. 9. the Learned *Vindicator* applies that Saying of St. Cyprian, *That a second Bishop is no Bishop*. The Doctor owns, If a Bishop, put into the Place of one deprived by the Lay-Power, be indeed no Bishop, that then we can't be obliged upon any account to submit to him. Now the *Vindicator* does not, as the Doctor misrepresents him, alledge that Saying of St. Cyprian to prove, That a Bishop put into, &c. any otherwise than upon the same Supposition that the Doctor himself makes; viz. That a Lay-Deprivation is null and invalid, cannot make the Episcopal Throne become Vacant. And then, to use the

Et cum post primum secundus esse non possit; quisquis post unum, qui solus esse debeat, factus est, non jam secundus ille, sed nullus est. Ep. 55.

Doctor's Translation of St. Cyprian, *Since there cannot be a second Bishop, where another is already in Possession, i. e. has a Right to the Possession, whether he be in actual Possession, or not, ( for that's meant here, as every one must own ) whosoever is made Bishop after another, who ought to be alone, the same is not a second, but none.*

And if this Reasoning holds, as, for ought I can see, it must, unless the Doctor will alter his Supposition, What shall we judge of the Second Part of his Book? What shall we say to the *Matters of Fact*, those *severe Things*, as my Lord Bishop of Sarum is pleas'd to call them, that do not admit of *Sophistry*? What shall we admire most? The Doctor's great Skill and Reading in Ecclesiastical History, or his wonderful Judgment in producing so many Examples, some from the most degenerate Times of Christianity, to prove only this, That in all Ages since the Empire became Christian, and the Profession of our Holy

11

Holy Religion was not only Safe, but Honourable, there have been found some men, who possibly to get or keep Preferment, have been guilty of unwarrantable Compliances: For such the Doctor must upon his own Hypothesis own they were, unless the Lay-Deprivations were back'd by a Synodical Sentence, or the deposed Bishops made room for their Successors by a Voluntary Resignation and Cession.

From hence it appears how necessary it was that the Doctor should first have shew'd us how far the Authority of the Civil Power extends, towards the depriving Bishops of their Spiritualties; because upon the settling of the Bounds of that, depends the measure of the Peoples Obedience to the present Possessor. For if the Civil Magistrate, as the *Vindicator* has endeavour'd to prove, have indeed no Power to deprive a Bishop; then those Christians, in the Instances the Doctor has cited, (which are to his purpose) no doubt acted very ill, in deserting him who had a Right to their Obedience, and adhering to another who had none. But the discussing this Point would have led the Doctor too far out of his Road of Ecclesiastical History, and put him upon a Work to which neither his Genius, nor the Course of his Studies, nor, it may be, those Secular Prospects he had at that time, did at all incline him.

But to return: As for that one *Gross Error* of this Author, in *preferring the Pretended Rights of particular persons before the good of the whole Body, &c.* If instead of that Epithet *Pretended*, you will put the word *Real*, every body will say you must bate me the *Gross Error* at the beginning of this Paragraph. And truly, Sir, your calling of them *pretended Rights*, will not make them such.

But as for the Proof of this, you leave it to some better Pen, if it shall be thought worth the while. And indeed I wish it may not be thought worth the while; since a further debating of this Matter is not likely in the present Posture of Affairs, to get the Church any more of its Just Rights than 'tis already possess'd of, and may possibly too  
much



much expose particular Persons. But if you should be tempted to write upon this Subject, and you should venture to endeavour the Confutation of this Learned and Pious Author, I shall take the boldness to recommend this Piece of Advice to you, That you would treat his Person with all that Respect which is due to his Extraordinary Merits; in a word, That you would behave yourself to him, as he behaves himself to all those he happens to differ from, with the greatest Deference, Candor, and Modesty.

And I am the rather inclined to take the liberty of recommending this to you, because by your way of writing you seem, I had almost said, Pedantically, to affect to be thought a *Moderate Man*. Which made me wonder the more, that you who had behaved your self with that Caution and Tenderness towards others, even where a little more Severity would not have been perhaps much amiss, should unluckily fail of it only there, where it was most due, and best deserv'd. *Moderation* is a Virtue that becomes a Scholar and a Minister better than any; but yet if it be misplac'd, it loses its Name and Nature, and degenerates into a vicious Lukewarmness and Indifferency. When the Foundations of all Religion in general, and the Sacred Truths of the Christian in particular, whether they be such as respect the Faith, or Government and Discipline of the Church, are not only sapped and undermined, but professedly and openly attack'd, by Atheists, Deists, and Latitudinarians, all that are in earnest with what they profess, ought presently to take the Alarm, and with a suitable Concern, and a becoming, discreet Zeal, boldly to defend their Holy Mother the Church, from these her false Friends, and declar'd Enemies. We are commanded to contend earnestly for the Faith, and to rebuke some men sharply; and though the Truth and Obligation of these Commands is own'd by all in Theory; yet, I know not how, by distinguishing Times, Seasons, and Circumstances, they are so evaded by most, that they have almost lost all their Force and Energy in Practice.

To what a deplorable State this Indifference in Matters of Religion, together with a good ample Toleration, will bring any Church in some time, we may judge from what we see in a Neighbour-State; where there is as great a variety and medly of Sects, Opinions, and Religions, as there was anciently of Tongues at *Babel*; where all Religions are profess'd, and none believ'd; where Men alter their Opinions in these Matters, as they do the Fashion of their Cloaths, according to their own Humour, or the Customs of the Country where they are, or the Examples of those with whom they converse. For so we are told by an Author, that has given an account of this Country, "That the Appearance of Religion is here like a Piece of Humanity, by which every one falls most into the Company or Conversation of those, whose Customs and Humours, whose Talk and Dispositions he likes best. And as in other Places, 'tis in every Man's choice with whom he will Eat, or Lodge, with whom go to Market, or to Court; so it is here with whom he will Pray, or go to Church, or associate himself in the Service, and Worship of God: Nor is any more notice taken, or censure pass'd of what every one chooses in these Cases, than in the other.

Sir W. T. of  
the *Nether-*  
*lands*, p. 207.

But how much soever such a State, and Face of Religion may advance the Trade, and Commerce of a Country, which I wish some Men don't prefer before all other Considerations; yet certainly nothing can be more prejudicial to Mens Eternal Interest, (which, whatever those Men may think, are infinitely preferable to the other) than this humour of Indifferency, and such an unlimited Toleration as is here described. For unless all Religions be alike, and every one shall be saved by living up to the Precepts of that Sect or Party which he is a Member of, (which no body that has any Religion will assert) it can be no indifferent thing with whom we associate our selves in the Service of God: Since among the many Sects and Parties of Religion, into which any Nation may be divided, it is certain but one of them can be in the true, and that, by joining with which alone, in a visible Communion,

B

Men

Men are made capable of being Saved in the Ordinary way, even upon performing all the other Conditions of Salvation. And if this be true, I cannot see but all Civil Magistrates are indispensably obliged, to use all fit means, that the *True Religion* may be profess'd by all those that live within their Dominions, however inconsistent this may be with Trade, or any other Worldly Advantage.

The Ingenious *Author* above-mentioned has given us a very good Account, how such an unlimited Toleration came to be settled in the Country I am speaking of. It was not their being satisfied of the Lawfulness, or even Expediency (in respect of Religion) of such an extravagant Liberty, that made them permit a mixture of all Religions among them, but the force of *Commerce*, and a *Trading Conversation*. This same Trade has a wonderful force and energy. We know whom it made Deny or Dissemble their Christianity in the *East Indies*. And I wish with all my heart, that Trade and *Commissioners for Trade* may have no ill influence upon the same Religion here in *England*.

And as our *Latitudinarians* are thus injurious to Religion, so are They no less, who are for altering our present Ecclesiastical Constitution, in order to comprehend a party of Men, who have no mind to come within the Pale of the Church; because they make their Markets much better by holding their Separate Conventicles. These are the Men whose common Theme of Discourse are the Miscarriages of the Two last Reigns; whether in Church or State; who read and admire the Secret Histories that have come out of late, of what no body besides the Authors of them, ever heard of. Others of them endeavour to shew their *Impartiality* and *Moderation* by owning some things that are charged upon the Church and Clergy, which are not really true. And this is the reason that I have known some Men accuse, and condemn themselves, recant, and give the Lie to their own Sermons, wherein they admirably well asserted and maintain'd the *Doctrine of Passive Obedience*, not above its due height, though perhaps in contradiction to the Opinions that are current at this time concerning it.

And



\* And I wish this be not the Motive which induced you, Sir, to make that Severe Reflection concerning the Management of *Church-Discipline* in this Nation. For, unless P. 31.  
you mean some few Miscarriages of *Lay-Chancellors*, I don't think you can give Three Instances of any very great mismanagement of *Church Power*, besides what the unhappy Circumstances of the Church Censures, being directed and govern'd by our Civil Laws, have necessarily involved those that inflict them in. So little reason you had to own any *Irregularities* and *Extravagancies* (no milder Terms, it seems, would serve your Turn) of those who (you are pleas'd to say) exercise Church Power *without regard to the Design, or Rules of Christianity*.

And now, Sir, I have done with my Remarks upon your *Paper*; which I had not troubled my self to take so much notice of, if you had not undeservedly spoken so disrespectfully of the *Vindicator of the Deprived Bishops*; whom all Men highly honour, for his great Innocence of Life, concern for Religion, and his incomparable Learning. Your Design in writing in behalf of *Church-Discipline*, which is very much wanted in this Nation, and which our Church in her Liturgy wishes might be restored, is highly commendable. 'Tis a Subject that well deserves an able Pen, one that is exactly well acquainted with Primitive Antiquity, to manage it. And though we be not all capable of saying all that might be said upon some particular Subjects, yet we ought to endeavour, as much as we can, to convince Men of those Sacred Truths, which, by the iniquity of the Times, are most discountenanced, and run down. I am, Sir,

Your, &c.



F I N I S.